

At 2 pm June 14, 1965, The Committee of Inquiry met to discuss the series of events leading to the selection of Dr. Elliott as President of the University by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on June 5th, 1965, which selection was contrary to the recommendations of the Special Committee of the Faculty, from the standpoint of Professor William Schmidt's recollection of them. Present were Professor Reuben E. Wood, Wolfgang H. Kraus, Forrester Davison (substituting for Roderic H. Davison, who is on leave) and Professor William Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt recounted the following events:

Asked if he knew why the Board of Trustees Committee chose Dr. Elliott as its candidate on Saturday the 5th of June, Mr. Schmidt replied that in terms of the Elliott process of selection, at the 12 May meeting - a joint meeting held with the Trustees, Mr. Ellison, Mr. McElway and ~~Mr~~ Graham were present. The meeting was at 5 pm. All the faculty committee was present except Walker, Stevens and LeBlanc (who proposed to resign). At this meeting the Trustees' Chairman named Elliott specifically as the candidate approved by Ellison. Ransom was also in the picture, however, and was to inform us by 22 May, if he still wished to be considered.

Asked about the master list of names used for interviewing candidates and its evolution, Professor Schmidt said an original list dated some time in September (of which we do not appear to have a copy) was submitted by the Board Committee which was numbered consecutively. The Board Committee continued to add to this list periodically. After some time, the Faculty revised the list removing some names which were out of the question and List #2, of which there are two versions, dated in October evolved, one original and one revised.

In reply to a question "Did the faculty take the sole initiative?", Mr. Schmidt stated that the first list came from the Board of Trustees.

In reply to "Was there no further possibility list thereafter?", Mr. Schmidt stated that the procedure was for each Committee to prepare a list of 10 names each. "On the 20th of October, we sent a list of 9 names to the Board. This was a preferred list, rather than a definitive list."

On the 30th of November, Mr. Ellison sent a letter to Mr. Miller describing the faculty as "restless" (see letter dated November 30 attached). (See also letter dated 8 December - Brown to Ellison letter.) Mr. Schmidt stated that some of the delay in action during this period was caused by waiting for Dean Rusk to be eliminated which occurred on December 8, 1964.

On December 8, the Board submitted an approved list of their candidates to the Faculty Committee. Their list included Mr. Truman and Mr. Weaver as the Faculty Committee's had also. Otherwise the names were different. On January 13, 1965, the Committee received a letter or memorandum from Dr. Brown referring to the Faculty Committee meeting on January 11, 1965 which contained a preliminary judgment of the names of the list. (The original Board list was 14 pages long and contained 104 names)

On January 11, on the basis of such memoranda, we made a very preliminary rating of our list and as many as possible of theirs. This group contained the names of Bell, Truman, Macy, Weaver, Brown and Gordon.

Mr. Macy had been considered on the former President Carroll list but had been eliminated for personal reasons. It was decided that on the basis of his record, however, he should be considered again. The Board Committee agreed to explore certain names on our list even though they did not appear on theirs. Mr. Seaborg was approached but was unavailable.

Perkins and Hornig of Princeton - The Board did not know them so the Faculty Committee explored them. Gardner and Gross were unavailable, Seaborg was deleted. Truman and Weaver were approached by the Board but were unavailable. We continued interest in Weaver and Truman, and Macy. The Board Chairman was very impressed with Weaver and Truman.

We said John Perkins was unacceptable to the Faculty Committee but the Board was very impressed with him, even though he had been on the list the last time. (The Carroll list). Mr. Schmidt claimed in response to a question "Was there any specific record of Perkins at Delaware?" that he knew him through a classmate and also through the AAUP. We said he was unanimously unacceptable to us.

Asked did Mr. Ellison say why he was impressed with J. Perkins, Mr. Schmidt replied he had a very distinguished record at Delaware. We thought of him as a typical autocrat. We emphasized that we saw this in our interview.

Asked if the Chairman stated that the Board said they would not take someone unacceptable to the Faculty, Mr. Schmidt said that Mr. Ransom said he would not consider the job unless he had met the Faculty and was accepted by it.

Q. Did they take any names off the list?

A. They never expressly said this.

Mr. Schmidt remarked that Long was an autocrat, but that Wilson was a fine person but not presidential material.

Q. Did anyone mention that Long had been mentioned as a possibility for the Dean of the School of Government?

A. Possibly someone did.

Mr. Schmidt remarked that Babbidge, Gross, Gardner, Seaborg and Brooks were unavailable. Subsequently, as you see, the only names who turned out to be available were Hornig and Courtland Perkins.

David Truman said he would consider the job, was re-approached and said he was interested and was going to appear for an interview. But he said, "No" finally. Weaver was re-approached but he also said "No." Macy was out of the picture because of his government position.

We were left with Perkins and Gordon. On the 2nd of February, we were advised that some names were being reinstated and re-investigated around this time. Also some new ones were added. We saw Dunning and Dupres.

On the fifteenth of February, we received clerical help. A secretary was hired on the first of March.

The Board Committee thought highly of Wilson, Long and Perkins but not Dunning. The month of March shaped up with Perkins and Ransom. Ransom met with the Deans and Perkins met the Board, but not us. Mr. Brown's name was in from the beginning but was not pushed.

Asked "How early were indications given by the Board that Vice President Brown was not the man?", Mr. Schmidt replied, "I accepted it. In my judgment it was useless to pressure the point."

Q. What was the reason given by the Board that Mr. Brown was not acceptable to them?

A. President Carroll brought John A. Brown in as Vice President for Plans and Resources. The problem began in his being made Dean of Faculties. They felt he was

maneuvered into the office by a fait accompli. The Board did not think he should have been made Dean of Faculties. The Board felt he had been brought here to do a job. Let him do it. The Board complimented Mr. Brown as a person but not in terms of the presidency.

Now Ransom and Perkins were in the picture. On 9 March, Mr. Schmidt made a call to Texas but the person called was not discreet; he went to Ransom, and it got into the newspapers. This did not make Ransom withdraw, however. He did not want to be publicly addressed, because he had some other things in Texas he was in the midst of. We could not get in touch with him. Sometime in April, he met the Deans. Ellison said a call had been made to Texas. We were cautioned to be discreet. He called back in June but Courtland Perkins was being considered. There was no embarrassment.

Asked, "Did you receive any communication from Sharkey, who knew Ransom?" Mr. Schmidt replied he did not recall. He was finally sent a letter asking him to let us know by May 22nd to which he never replied. We couldn't go after him, so the case was closed. No further word came from him.

Asked "I understand a telephone call was made to Ransom from Airlie House about the student unrest etc. Also a copy of the newspaper describing it was mailed to him. Do you know about that?", Mr. Schmidt did not reply.

The Committee at that time voted 6-4 to make an overture to Perkins.

On April 1, being still very strongly interested in Perkins, we sent a list of names to the Board Committee with Perkins as first choice. The others were listed with no choices and consisted of Perkins, Brown, Ransom, Long and Dunning. The group at that time were definitive (?)

We had a joint meeting of the two Committees on April 10. We decided to take the step of sending someone to the campus at Princeton. Kaye and Schmidt went to the campus on two different days.

Q. There has been some question about the objectivity of the Committee about this time. I wonder about the vote 6-4. Does this mean 6 people voted for Perkins and 4 against him?

A. No, it would be liking having a list to vote for and six voted for Perkins and four for Brown. The majority then recommended Perkins.

Sometime after April 12, Mr. Perkins came down to the campus upon our invitation. On April 21, he declined the position. Mr. Miller wrote to him expressing his regret at this decision on April 29 to which, Mr. Perkins replied on May 4 and Mr. Miller again wrote to him on May 7. (See file). The Faculty Committee did not see Mr. Perkins when he came to The George Washington University. In fact, we never saw him.

On May 7, the Deans and Chairman had their meeting at Noon on Friday. On May 10 (?) Saturday, the Faculty Committee met.

Q. Do you want to express an opinion about whether the Dean's meeting was bringing unfair pressure, out of channels, upon your Committee?

A. There was some question as to whether it was legal or illegal. I did not look at it that way.

Q. Did it appear to discredit your Committee?

A. Yes, to some extent.

(There was some further discussion here about the purpose of the Dean's meeting which was said to express concern rather than to present a candidate. It was stated that if the Faculty Committee had been more active, the step would not have been taken, etc. Mr. Schmidt did not comment.)

On May 8, the question of whether or not Mr. J. A. Brown should be the only candidate listed was discussed. A vote was taken and it was decided against this proposition. Three members then decided to resign from the Committee if they could not have Mr. Brown as the leading candidate.

On May 12th, the Board Committee named Mr. Elliott as its leading candidate. (See Miller memorandum about trying to "nail down" how this was stated.) There was some question as to whether we should tell the Faculty Assembly on June 5. (We thought he was going to present a solution on that date or might have suggested a plan, etc.)

To go back a little, on May 8, the majority met and voted to continue the search and named its three persons who should be studied. We needed more information on Cleveland and Dunning.

On Monday, May 10, 1965, Chairman Ellison met with the Deans and Chairmen. On Wednesday, May 12 (see memorandum for the record of this meeting), Ellison met with us, presented a memorandum of names: Brown, Ransom, Elliott. We agreed to have interviews, first off-campus, then on-campus.

On the 29th of May, we had a joint(Committee of the Board and Faculty) meeting. Mr. Ellison said we are inclined to take Elliott. The Faculty Committee met after this meeting and took the stand that the Elliott candidacy was very serious.

On Tuesday, June 1 and Wednesday, June 2, Mr. Schmidt and Dr. Brown visited the Maine campus.

Q. Do you know anything about the reported message from Chairman Ellison to the Board members asking for a unanimous vote on Elliott?

A. I've heard of it.

At the Maine campus, Dr. Brown met with a student (Romansky) who was also a member of the staff, and obtained a campus newspaper. I got a catalog from Mr. Houser of the Maine University. We picked out sixteen people from the list. We each took eight persons to interview. I started in the Chemistry Department.

Mr. Schmidt then stated some of the remarks of persons he interviewed. He felt that 3/4 of the faculty would be sorry to see him leave, he had made some unsuitable appointments etc. Both Mr. Schmidt and Dr. Brown were very explicit in stating why they were there - they were faculty representatives from The George Washington University, studying a number of names being seriously considered for the Presidency, and asked them to be discreet. They compared what they had learned about Elliott with the criteria.

Mr. Schmidt affirmed that the Board had never stated it accepted these criteria.

June 3rd - The Committee caucased and voted 7-0 against Elliott, with 3 abstentions. It caucased again on June 4 at 2 pm, reaffirmed the vote of 7-0 against Elliott, with 3 abstentions.

We voted then to continue the search by a vote of 7-3.

We voted for John A. Brown, Jr. to be Acting President if the search continued by a vote of 7-1 with 2 abstentions.

(Mr. Schmidt stated that one of the Interim Reports carries a statement about the Acting President)

Dr. Brown and Mr. Schmidt spoke before the Board Committee. Gave the principle facts on Dr. Elliott: a) administrative transfer of his ability at Maine or Cornell - somewhat negative - land-grant college outlook. Outside the University the outlook is good, inside the university, not so good. b) Appointments of Dean of Graduate Students - not good. Appointment of Vice President (Administration), not so good. c) Ability to develop substantial amounts of funds - good with State legislature, paper pulp industry. Secured 6 endowed chairs. d) Quality of academic leadership - Could not find within him the person we wanted to come up to high stature we are seeking. Students say he does not have rapport with the faculty. e) Ability to get along with people on all levels - good.

He makes decisions unilaterally. The faculty is not involved. In the course of Mr. Schmidt's description of Dr. Elliot's autocratic leadership, the Board asked him how Dr. Elliott got along with the students. He gets along well with them.

Dr. Brown in conclusion stated that if the Board were going to choose this candidate, we wanted to put our statements before the whole Board. To which the Committee Chairman replied that our position as we had stated it would be transmitted to the Board. We went downstairs and started talking. Mr. Hughes walked in and said, of course we could come up.

Mr. E. K. Morris attended the last two meetings of the joint committees.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

WES

November 19, 1964

Newell Ellison, Chairman  
Board of Trustees

Dear Mr. Ellison:

When you met with us at the outset of our present task we were both reassured and gratified to discover how fully you and your fellow Trustees had appreciated the urgency of the problem of presidential succession at the University. We determined at that time to do all we could to assist in locating the best possible person in the shortest possible time. In this spirit, we offer you this brief progress report as prologue to a request that you call on us to facilitate your task in any way which would serve our mutual purpose.

The material we have gathered on our nominees comes under three general headings: summations of biographical data taken from published sources; notes based on confidential letters, visits, and telephone conversations between Committee members and sources close to the nominees; letters from our faculty-and-administration colleagues recommending candidates and offering supporting evidence. If the Trustees' Committee would find it useful, we will be happy to share our accumulated information with you in whatever way you might suggest: i.e., either in its present state or in the form of lists, resumes, or abstracts.

Because of the nearly certain unavailability of John W. Gardner and Mason W. Gross the list of nominees we offered at our joint meeting of October 22 has shrunk to seven. We are prepared to expand our list with new names, but we feel that our information-gathering will become significantly more productive once we have the opportunity to share the materials and opinions assembled by the Trustees' Committee. The case on our nominees is by now as complete as we can make it short of special visits to out-of-town institutions and direct interviews. The fact that we have refrained from ranking our nominees should not be taken as a lack of commitment, but as a mark of deference to the Trustees' Committee. We feel that we know our nominees well; we are prepared to make a strong, balanced recommendation on each of the persons we have named.

We sincerely trust that we may serve constructively in the incisive resolution of our present task.

Respectfully,

*Thomas McP. Brown*

Thomas McP. Brown, Chairman  
Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult  
on the Selection of the President of the  
University

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Interdepartmental Memorandum

May 13, 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

RE: Meeting with the Trustees Committee on May 12th

A meeting was held with the Trustees Committee on May 12th at 5:00 P.M. Present were all original members of the Faculty Committee except Bob Walker who is out of the country. Mr. Ellison, Mrs. Graham and Mr. McKelway were present for the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Ellison reviewed the matter and, after considerable discussion, the following points emerged:

- a. The Trustees Committee will recommend to the full Board at its meeting on June 5th that a president be appointed. The choice will be from the following three men: John Anthony Brown, Jr., Harry H. Ransom, and Lloyd H. Elliott.
- b. In the event that the Board decides upon either Ransom or Elliott, the Faculty Committee will be fully consulted in a joint meeting of the two Committees, and will be given full opportunity to check out the background of the person.
- c. Mr. Ellison said that it was all right to announce to the faculty that the Trustees Committee would recommend to the full Board a name on June 5th. The names, however, must remain confidential.

Arthur S. Miller  
Secretary

Copies to Faculty Committee

To be zeroed

EDWARD B. BURLING  
JOHN LORD O'BRIAN  
NEWELL W. ELLISON  
THOMAS AUBERN  
HOWARD C. WESTWOOD  
GERHARD A. GESELL  
HUGH S. COX  
W. GRAHAM CLAYTON, JR.  
JOHN T. SAPIENZA  
NESTOR S. FOLEY  
DANIEL M. GRIBSON  
HARRY L. SHIDERMAN  
DON Y. HARRIS, JR.  
JAMES L. M. KAY  
WEAVER W. DUNNAN  
J. RANDOLPH WILSON  
ROBERTS S. OWEN  
EDGAR F. CZARRA, JR.  
WILLIAM H. ALLEN

DEAN G. ACHESON  
JOHN G. LAYLIN  
FONTAINE C. BRADLEY  
EDWARD BURLING, JR.  
JOE. BARLOW  
DONALD HISS  
J. HARVEY COVINGTON  
W. CROSSBY ROOPER, JR.  
JAMES M. MCLOTHLIN  
ERNEST W. JENNES  
STANLEY L. TEMKO  
PAUL C. WARNE  
WILLIAM STANLEY JR.  
HAMILTON CAROTHERS  
J. PHOME ACKERMAN  
HENRY P. SAILER  
JOHN H. SCHAFER

WES

COVINGTON & BURLING  
UNION TRUST BUILDING  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20005

REPUBLIC 7-5900

November 30, 1964

Mr. Arthur S. Miller  
The Law School  
The George Washington University  
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Mr. Miller:

I find that I have not acknowledged your letter of November 20 giving me the names of Alfred DeGrazia and Thomas Hamilton to be added to our list. I have been away for a few days which in part accounts for my not having written you.

Your Committee may be getting somewhat restless, as am I, about the current delay. But there is a very good reason for it, and I will have to ask that you accept my word for it. I do not want to mention any name in this letter, but we have been awaiting word from one particular man as to whether he would be interested and I expect to know the answer within a week. If his answer is in the negative, we must then move ahead at full speed on other fronts and we are prepared to do it.

During this interlude I have not had my Committee together because they know why we are waiting, and for this reason I have not had a chance to assemble them and get a list of their first ten choices. I will ask that you assure your Committee that we are proceeding in the way we think best, and I expect us to have an answer to the one thing that is delaying us within a week.

Cordially yours,

  
Newell W. Ellison

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL TO FACULTY COMMITTEE TO ADVISE AND CONSULT WITH THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON THE SELECTION OF A PRESIDENT OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, 9 April 65

RE: COURTLAND PERKINS (following trip of Wm. E. Schmidt to Princeton on 6 April 65)

The remarks cited below were paraphrased from conversations with persons who represent the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. Some of the sources know Perkins only through professional association. Others know both Mr. and Mrs. Perkins socially.

Not at all surprised to hear that he is being considered for the presidency of a university. Can understand that he would emerge as a strong candidate. He is one of the figures on the campus who is making a significant impact on the outside world.

Brings people in diverse fields together. Genuine interest in many subjects.

Enormously energetic. Thoroughly enjoys "flitting about" the nation and the world to do consulting. Will understand clearly the need of a president to "flit about" to solicit funds for his institution.

Administers department of prima donnas well. Aerospace is the best department in the School of Engineering. In the merger of mechanical engineering with aeronautical engineering to form Aerospace and Mechanical Sciences, mechanical engineering is the "weak sister." Aerospace is a selfsustaining department. Budget exceeds two million dollars. Perkins obtains funds largely from Guggenheim Foundation, industry, and govt.

Outstanding lecturer. Has spoken on problems of organization before the meetings of the Society of Sigma Xi. Others turn to him concerning delicate or thorny administrative problems. The designation "entrepreneurial" was given several times.

Authority on airplane performance, stability, and control. Gives graduate course on this subject with emphasis on airplane as basic research tool. Author of text. Editor of three volumes of treatise of Advanced Group for Aeronautical Research and Development (NATO).

Reared in cultured environment. Good at bridging the "two cultures." Attends plays and concerts on and off campus. Plays piano and electric organ. Reads novels during flights on consulting trips.

His wife and he are gracious hosts. The adjectives "charming" and "wonderful" were often chosen to describe the couple.

An intimate said that brothers Courtland and James Perkins are quite close. Suspects that Courtland likes the opportunities that he sees coming to his brother a university president.

WES

Written statement of PROFESSOR ARTHUR S. MILLER to the Special Committee of the Faculty Assembly established to inquire into situations when the Board of Trustees do not follow Faculty recommendations.

#### Background

I served as Secretary of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult with the Board of Trustees on the Selection of a President for the University. Interviews with members of the Special Committee were held on June 10 and June 11. This statement is submitted to supplement what was said during those interviews. It is requested that it be made a part of the record of the Special Committee and reproduced and distributed to the Faculty as a part of that Committee's report.

#### Guiding Principle

Much has been said about "principle." The principle which, in my judgment, must guide everyone is the "best interests of the University." A university, including this one, does not exist for its faculty or for its trustees; perhaps it does not even exist for its students, although they obviously do and should occupy first attention. A university, it is emphasized, exists for the service it renders to the community -- the American people, people generally. Thus its primary responsibility is the dissemination of knowledge through teaching. But there are other components of service, including research (the furthering of knowledge, pushing the frontiers of knowledge on) which also serve an educational function for a wider "student body" -- other professors, students elsewhere, at times the public at large, and including operating as a center for "independent" or "objective" analyses of important issues. Accordingly, when one talks of the "best interests of the University," he must bear in mind not only its various components (students, faculty, administration, trustees) but also its several missions (teaching, research, publication, responsible criticism).

Some espouse other matters of "principle," but these, in my judgment, ~~must~~ be subordinate to the overriding principle of the best interests of the University (as outlined above). From this, it follows that no segment of the University is beyond criticism and beyond improvement; and it also follows that somewhere within the University community there must be a "final" or "ultimate" authority — a "sovereign" — which should not be despotic and which should listen to and communicate with other parts of the community. The hard fact is that in this, as with other universities, that "sovereign" is and must be the Board of Trustees. They should listen to and communicate with administration, with faculty, and with students, but the power of decision in certain matters must unquestionably rest in their hands.

The Activities of the Faculty Committee

The following statements are made in the interest of having a full record of the activities of the Faculty Committee to Advise and Consult on the Selection of a President. They are not listed in order of importance.

1. The Faculty Committee was ~~"listened to"~~ "listened to," "consulted," and its advice obtained by the Trustees' Committee.
  - (a). The initiative for this had to be that of the Faculty Committee. Except for the final two meetings (on June 4 & 5) with the Trustees' Committee, any joint meetings or meetings with Mr Ellison had to be initiated by the Faculty Committee.
  - (b). It was made clear from the outset that the Trustees would retain the ultimate power of decision, and that the Faculty Committee was to play an advisory role only. The Faculty Committee was never told otherwise.
  - (c). Nevertheless, the Trustees' Committee did accept and go along with Faculty Committee views on certain candidates. The Faculty Committee, on at least one occasion, exercised a "veto"; on another occasion, the Faculty Committee's choice of leading candidate prevailed.
  - (d). The necessary conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing is that the Faculty Committee in all likelihood had more "communication" with the Board than has ever before been attained (at least in recent decades). Far from "perfect" or even "good," nevertheless the communication was there. Often it seemed to take the form of the negotiation of treaties between antagonists.
  - (e). An attempt should have been made to institutionalize informal contacts between one or two Trustees and one or two faculty members. A much better working relationship could have been effected in that way. The two committees were too large and cumbersome; much of their routine work could and should have been done by a joint subcommittee working together. The full committees could then have reviewed the work of the subcommittee. In my judgment, such a system would have had the effect of much closer relationships between the two committees.

2. Throughout its activities (at least to the final few weeks, for an account of which see 3., below) the Faculty Committee stressed two factors: (a) the great urgency in filling the presidency as soon as possible; and (b) obtaining the best possible person. The overriding factor was the latter -- getting the "best man" -- but it was always recognized, and communicated to the Board, that the position should be filled as soon as possible.

3. The work of the Faculty Committee seemed to deteriorate in the final month or so.

- (a). One cause of this, in my judgment, was the pressure brought to bear through the operation of groups (deans and departmental chairmen) acting outside of the Code and Ordinances of the University. This had the result of effectively undercutting Committee activity.
- (b). It is my considered judgment that the Faculty Committee, as a group, could not have given an objective appraisal of any candidate during its final two or three weeks of operation. It had splintered badly and no longer acted as a group, but, rather, as a group of individuals going their several ways.
- (c). The Faculty Committee failed in the final several weeks to develop new candidates. This meant that it did not present to the Board any acceptable alternative candidate to the Board's final choice.

4. The Trustees seemed to be under great pressure to make a decision.

5. It is my considered judgment that the "affirmative" case for Dr. Lloyd Elliott had not been presented to the Faculty Assembly. In this connection, I wish to make it clear that I do not agree with the conclusions of the Faculty Committee as stated in the meeting of the Assembly on June 7th. A statement of that "affirmative" case should be requested from the Trustees. It is my considered judgment that any fair-minded person will find that Dr. Elliott measures up better against the criteria of selection than some people think.

6. A great need exists for an institutionalized means of improving communication between and among all segments of the University community -- students, faculty, administration, trustees. Major efforts should be made to accomplish this. When it is done, however, it must be recognized that communication means not only a method of discourse; it also means having something to talk about. This performance will require hard and careful thought on the part of individual faculty members as to specific programs for University improvement. I believe this to be of surpassing importance.

At no time was the Faculty Committee (or the Trustees) presented with persuasive evidence to the contrary. At best, the evidence garnered by members of the Faculty Committee gives a "mixed" picture; the worst that can be said about Dr. Elliott is: (a) he made two "bad" appointments by a procedure which has since been corrected and (b) his presidential experience (but not all his experience) is at a "land-grant" college.

7. The Faculty Committee's activities were hampered by a failure to keep much of its work confidential. True throughout its existence, the breakdown of any decent system of security became very apparent in the final several weeks. In my judgment, the task of selection of a president cannot be conducted unless it is done in secret.

8. A need exists for "logistic" support of a committee such as the Faculty Committee. It was only in its final three months that adequate secretarial assistance was made available. However, money for committee activities (travel, telephone calls, etc.) was always available in ample amounts.

Caveat

The Special Committee of Inquiry bears a great responsibility in its assigned tasks. These are delicate matters. It is imperative that objectivity prevail. In this connection, it is not irrelevant to note that one member of the Special Committee participated in, and signed the statement of, the deans and departmental chairmen (see 3.,(a) above). I do not suggest that this will distort his judgment but do believe that it places a special burden upon him. A cardinal tenet of American jurisprudence is that no one should be a judge in his own cause or in a matter in which he has been involved.

ARTHUR S. MILLER  
Professor of Law



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

LAW SCHOOL

ARTHUR S. MILLER  
PROFESSOR OF LAW

18th June 1965

Professor Reuben Wood  
George Washington University  
Washington 6, D. C.

Dear Reuben:

Further to my previous letters:

1. As stated to the Committee of which you are chairman, there is to be no attribution of statements in your final report unless I see them first. I do not want to be quoted by name.

2. Enclosed is my written statement about which I wrote you. Please make this a part of your report, distributing it with your report.

3. Corrections of transcripts: June 10 interview -- paragraph 13: I believe the Dean is still at Maine; in last paragraph of third from last page, that statement I made should read: "The man (Elliott) does not seem to have the stature at this time." Same paragraph: I did not tell Trustees that Brown and Schmidt had failed to make a convincing case against Elliott; this ~~/,//~~ statement (the second I had made) was made in a meeting of the Faculty Committee held after our meeting with the Trustees.

June 11: last line of first full paragraph on first page should be deleted; it is meaningless as now stated. Third from last paragraph on page 2: this should read ". . . 'Yes, by some members of the Committee and . . .'"'; on page 3, second paragraph: my statement was that in my opinion Elliott did not have the characteristics Perkins had in the same degree as Perkins, but that he had more affirmative characteristics than had been made apparent to the Faculty at its meeting on June 7th.

- - -

Please acknowledge receipt. I reaffirm at this time the requests contained in my letter to you of 15th June. Please inform me as to when you expect to make your report.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

Arthur S. Miller

Enc.



(4.) Those about whom our present information gives us reason to believe that we do not want to consider them favorably;

John A. Perkins  
John T. Wilson  
Harlan Cleveland  
Clarence D. Long

We wish to re-emphasize our feeling of urgency in this matter and to indicate that we are seriously concerned about the length of time that has elapsed. In all candor we feel that while the selection of a new President, of course, is ultimately the Board's responsibility, the Faculty Committee has not, thus far, been able to discharge fully its responsibilities to the Faculty, under the Faculty Code and Ordinance.

We stand ready to assist you in every possible way.

Sincerely,



Thomas McP. Brown, M. D.  
Chairman,  
Faculty Committee to Advise  
and Consult on the Selection  
of the President of the University



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE  
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE

WES

MAILING ADDRESS:  
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL  
901 23RD STREET, N. W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20037

January 13, 1965

Mr. Newell Ellison  
701 Union Trust Building  
15th and H Streets, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Ellison:

At a meeting of the Faculty Committee, on January 11th, action was taken to consolidate your list and ours and to develop a list of priority. We have established 4 listings, as follows:

(1.) Those, on the basis of present knowledge, in whom we are most interested. This listing is in order of priority;

John C. Weaver  
John W. Marcy  
David B. Truman  
John Anthony Brown  
Kermit Gordon  
David E. Bell

Since our meeting the knowledge that Weaver and Truman are unavailable will require us to draw up another list. We will send this to you in the near future.

(2.) Those about whom we do not have enough data, but are actively seeking;

Donald F. Hornig  
Courtland Perkins

(3.) Those we understand are not available;

Homer D. Babridge, Jr.  
Glenn T. Seaborg  
Harvey Brooks  
John W. Gardner  
Mason W. Gross